

Women's Votes Needed to Effect Certain Moral Reforms

Representative Palmer Says the Great Problems of State Government Are Moral Questions, and Not Political Nor Economic.



Copyright Harris & Ewing

Representative A. Mitchell Palmer.

WOMAN suffrage, in my view, is not so much a political question as a moral question," said A. Mitchell Palmer, Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania.

In conservative Pennsylvania the movement to give women the right to vote has come to the front only within a very short time. But it is making rapid headway. The gentler sex has taken the matter up with great enthusiasm, and the support given to the cause by Congressman Palmer has won for him much pettiat popularity.

"I come of Quaker stock," Mr. Palmer went on. "My people came to this country with William Penn. This means that there runs in my veins the blood of those who were pioneers in advocating equal rights for women."

"The Quakers were first in America to give women equal rights with men in respect of education. They gave equal rights to women in the church, that is to say, in the business meetings of the Society of Friends. It was they who established the first coeducational institution of learning on this continent, which received students of both sexes on equal terms. I refer to Swarthmore College."

"It is the most natural thing in the world that I, having been born a Quaker, and being myself a graduate of Swarthmore College, should be in favor of granting equal rights to women in the management of public affairs. The Quakers were the pioneers in every movement which has had to do with guaranteeing to women the enjoyment and exercise of equal rights with men."

"I believe that, fundamentally, nearly all of the questions that come up in State government are moral questions, and not political, nor economic. Women are the great moral force in every community; they are on the right side of every moral question and of every question of morals."

"I should be in favor, therefore, of a proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in such a way as to provide for equal suffrage in all the States of the Union, were it not that such a plan is impracticable at the present time. It could not go through. Many of the States would refuse to indorse it, especially those of the South where there are other problems that complicate it, most importantly the negro."

"My notion is that the practical thing is to get an amendment providing for a referendum on the subject in each State when a certain percentage of the voters shall demand it. The voters of the individual States will thus have an opportunity to say yes or no to the proposition."

"With this idea in view, I offered the other day, in the House, the following joint resolution, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"Whenever any number of legal voters of any State, to a number exceeding 8 per cent. of the number of legal voters voting at the last preceding general election held in such State, shall petition for the submission to the legal voters of such State the question whether women shall have equal rights with men in respect to voting at all elections to be held in such State, such question shall be so submitted. And, if upon such submission, a majority of the legal voters of the State voting on the question shall vote in favor of granting to women such equal rights, the same shall thereupon be deemed established, anything in the Constitution or laws of such State to the contrary notwithstanding."

"Such a proposition is no violation of

the doctrine of State rights. The matter concerned is simply one of local self-government and home rule. The suggested amendment, of course, would require ratification by three-fourths of all the States. If it comes up in my State I shall certainly back it with all my might."

"I stand on the woman suffrage question where my mother, were she alive to-day, would have me stand. I shall support with my voice, and with all the energy I can command, the proposition that the women of Pennsylvania shall have equal rights with the men of Pennsylvania; and so likewise with the women of the country at large."

"The great problems of Pennsylvania, because in their nature moral rather than economic or political, call loudly for the support of the women of Pennsylvania. We must have them in the fight if we are to win in the end. And what is true of Pennsylvania in this regard may be truthfully said of any other individual State."

"One of the moral problems to which I allude is the iniquitous system of child labor. I have introduced a bill in Congress to apply the power to Congress, bestowed upon it by the Constitution, to regulate interstate commerce in children—the sort of traffic which involves the shipment of thousands of little boys and girls from the vegetable and small

fruit gardens of the North to the oyster and shrimp canneries of the Gulf coast, and back again, from season to season, depriving them of all opportunity for gaining an education and inflicting upon them deplorable hardships. This, however, is only one feature of the commerce in question. If my bill is passed it will go far toward curing the evil, in the belief of both the Child Labor Association of Pennsylvania and the Child Labor Association of America."

"For the sake of little children in mines and factories in every part of the land we are anxious to obtain the earnest and effective support of the women of Pennsylvania and of the nation at large. That support, it goes without saying, is already behind the bill which I have introduced in Congress; but it would be behind it with tremendously more force if the men to whom women make their appeal when writing on the subject to Senators and Representatives knew that if they did not go right the women had in their hands a club which would compel them to go right."

"There is nothing in the world of which a member in Congress is so much afraid as the 'people back home.' A letter addressed by a woman to a Representative or Senator is nothing more than an appeal, which he may feel it his privilege to ignore. If it comes from a man, on the other hand, it bears at least a remote suggestion of a threat, because he has in his hand a club—which is his vote at the next election—for carrying a threat into execution."

"When women have the right to vote, they are not until then will their advocacy of a reform possess as much weight as that of men. And it is safe to say that, in the promotion of moral ends, they will carry it much further than men would."

"It is only within very recent years that women have had equal rights of property with men. They possess such rights already in most of the States. It may be taken for granted that the right to vote once gained they will soon procure for themselves equal rights in all respects."

"The women are hammering vigorously on the doors of Congress. At the start they have met with some discouragement; but they will continue their efforts, and the obstacles opposing them will not prove to be so formidable as they now appear. Their ingenuity may be counted upon to find a means for overcoming certain legislative difficulties which are largely of a technical character."

"When the first barriers have been swept away, so that the representatives of the people can come face to face with the merits of this suffrage question, the Congress, as surely as the sun rises tomorrow, will grant to the women of the United States the right to vote."

TOOK REWARD IN ADVANCE.

Person Who Found Lost Handbag Kept \$12 for Himself.

BOSTON, May 9.—The person who picked up the handbag of Mrs. Henry Lyman Shaw at the Progressive bazaar at the Cornhill Plaza last week evidently believed in receiving a reward in advance. At any rate, although the handbag and the purse which it contained, together with papers and keys, were returned safely, \$12 in currency was missing. The property, less the \$12, was returned from Lynn express collect; no reward was asked, for reward had been made.

A faded advertisement, Mrs. Shaw agreed to ask "no questions," and the person who was good enough to return the handbag and part of its contents is not likely to answer questions, for the reason that the property was not accompanied by any clue.

Mrs. Shaw is glad to get her property back, but regrets that its temporary loss obliged her to change the locks on her house at 19 Commonwealth avenue and at her summer home at Swampscott at an expense of \$25.

Replies to Arguments Advanced by A. M. Anti Against Woman Suffrage

By FRANCIS HACKETT.

WHEN Old Doc Smith wants to sell you his Prairie Remedy he assures you that this precious fluid, coming in the small size and the family size, will not only cure your hacking cough and end your catarrh, asthma, croup and hay fever but that it will also, in due emergency, be very useful for stopping nosebleeds and removing warts.

Founded on a knowledge of man's credulity, this habit of large and manly assertion has not been confined to the patent medicine man who wishes to put the Prairie Remedy up behind the pendulum brooms and onions on the shelves of every country store from Maine to Oregon. Claims that make Old Doc Smith seem like a shrinking kitten are the very commonplace of political and social experience. And the habit of extravagance has so grown that the introduction of ordinary candor into political discussion is like the introduction of daylight into a scene of glided revelry. Under such circumstances natural light is in the worst possible taste.

As an example of extravagance, I have enjoyed an anonymous article on woman suffrage in last Sunday's SUN. The man who wrote this article called himself A. M. Anti and he wrote the article with a double purpose. His first purpose was not to assert his dissent from but to destroy the conscientious and able cause for woman suffrage that Mrs. Whitehouse has been making week by week in the Sunday SUN. His next purpose, which in a way includes the first, was to explode the entire notion of woman suffrage itself. And it was this purpose that betrayed him into extravagances which would discredit any man not living in an age inclined to the bombast of Old Doc Smith.

To read the article of A. M. Anti one would think that the introduction of woman suffrage into the United States was a design comparable to the introduction of leprosy or the promulgation of cannibalism. It would be impossible to follow all the fantasies of his mind on this subject, but among other points of view, not that woman suffrage is a deplorable extension of power in government,

but that it is a dire calamity, that it is against the laws of nature, that it is opposed to social betterment, that it is opposed to progress, that suffrage is "fatally mistaken," that divorce is increasing enormously in all the suffrage States, that suffrage leads to a lamentable disruption of the home, that its result or accompaniment is adultery and immorality, and that its extension threatens serious and irreparable harm not only to women but to the very social fabric itself.

When a child with a scowling count of a nightmare our first impulse is to flood the room with light and to say: "My poor lamb, don't be frightened. Everything is all right. You are right here at home, in your own bed. It was only a bad dream, and you needn't fear that the gooi-goo-eyed monster will eat you up. I won't let him eat you up! I'll leave the light burning, and remember that he doesn't exist at all except in your own little head."

In regard to the monster of equal suffrage I feel the same paternal desire to pat A. M. Anti's fevered brow and bring him the assurance that the laws of nature are still inviolate and the cause of social betterment unimpaired. But there is this difference between a child's nightmare and an adult's, that the child can be soothed while the adult must be reasoned with. On this account one must seek to disentangle some of the snarls in the article of A. M. Anti.

Anti's first symptom of nightmare relates to the principle that government is founded on force. Having stated and indorsed that famous principle, he adds with enormous satisfaction: "This is a clear demonstration of the reason why men alone have been granted the vote in enlightened countries." From this we are compelled to make one of two conclusions, either that his fundamental contention is unsound or that the countries where women do now actually vote are not enlightened.

If Anti refuses to abandon his fundamental principle we must take it that he denies enlightenment not only to New Zealand and Scandinavia but to New Zealand and Scandinavia plus California, Colorado, Kansas and Illinois. He talks about suffrage as if it were a wild and terrifying uncertainty, not a sober and pedestrian fact. A man in a nightmare harbors many delicate monstrosities!

But one fantasy does not prove a nightmare. Here is another. Mrs. Whitehouse says: "We all agree that women are better off to-day than they have ever been." Anti is delighted. He avers that this is the best possible corroboration of the claim that women should be content, and he proudly assures the world that men "may be depended on to continue their aid to social betterment and evolution." From this it would seem that the main credit for woman's improvement is due to man.

Woman, it appears, is an article of manufacture on which good kind man has been working for years. The article has gradually and steadily improved. It is very gratifying to man, and he beats to say that he expects to do as well in the future as he has done in the past. With his aid he ventures to believe that all will be well with the process of evolution.

Whether Anti regards woman as an article of manufacture or as a sober object, some kind of domestic animal, I am in doubt. But I am convinced he has every faith that with his aid and the aid of his kind he will bring her, "constantly though slowly," to a state of perfection. This, naturally, no reasonable domestic animal could be dissatisfied.

"Woman's property rights were fully established without themselves voting." This proves irrefutably to Anti that women do not need the vote. To enjoy this fantasy let us suppose that Anti belongs to a club, but because he has the fortune to be a Holy Roller he is not only debarred from voting but he is not allowed to use the dining room. Finally when he pleads that even Holy Rollers like to eat, his rights to use the dining room are magnanimously granted. And then a cheerful Gentle says: "My intelligent and earnest friend, still seeking a vote, still bent on destroying the social fabric and hitting the hand that fed you! Do you not realize that I am always ready to aid you? But you refuse to use the dining room, you fully satisfied with your own state of perfection. Does not that irrefutably prove that you no longer need a vote? Mr. Holy Roller,

GIRLS WITH PUBLIC SPIRIT

Women's Municipal League Recruits Volunteer Inspectors.

THE Street Cleaning Department is receiving the help of a band of sharp-eyed volunteer inspectors who are looking after the matter of garbage disposal. The Waring Juvenile Citizens League, an organization of school boys and girls recruited by the Women's Municipal League, is making a canvass of the city to see what people are giving the D. S. C. men to empty.

On the upper West Side there are galvanized iron garbage cans very generally provided with covers. But on the East Side there is a motley collection of old boxes, dishpans and wash boilers. This is contrary to the law, for the receptacles are seldom dust proof, their contents leak, and the men's time is consumed unnecessarily in emptying large numbers of small containers.

Perhaps the organization most active in this work is the American Post; the divisions of the league are called posts. This post consists of Jewish girls in a neighborhood that is rapidly becoming Italian. The girls have adapted themselves to changing conditions and are holding meetings for Italian women with speakers of their own nationality at the recreation rooms, 186 Chrystie street, to explain the sanitary code. The girls have asked Commissioner Fetherston to enforce the rule requiring tenants to put their garbage cans out on the street before 10 A. M.

Last summer the American Post, which contains only twelve members, succeeded in having the streets of its district flushed from the hydrants every day. Commissioner Edwards at first believed the request of the girls to be against the law, but they proved that it was not and he complied with it, to the great relief of the neighborhood.

Before they began their garbage campaign the children took up the matter of vacant lots and wrote letters to the people who lived near by asking them not to make dumping grounds of these possible play places. They also investigated the cellars and dumb-waiter shafts of the tenements in which they lived.

In many cases they found that the door required by law at the foot of the shaft missing or permanently hooked back, giving the flames a fine pathway through the building in case of fire. Incidentally they examined the mouths of the speaking tubes to see if they complied with the law. They decided that these tubes ought to be abolished in favor of bells and told the Health Department so. They talked to the janitors about keeping the shaft doors shut, and put up signs asking the tradesmen to close them.

In the intervals of their D. S. C. work they are inspecting the subway and the elevated at the request of President Theodore P. Shonts himself. Mr. Shonts spoke to one of the groups of the league not long ago and asked them to keep an eye on the men whom the interborough hires to sweep its steps. The children are investigating at regular hours and reporting.

The posts all meet in their respective school houses, and all the posts in a neighborhood are frequently gathered together to hear some city official about his department. Each post has its own leader and holds a weekly meeting at the school. Miss Marion C. Peters directs the work on behalf of the Women's Municipal League.

She sees that the children have jaunts and outings, especially in the summer, and the real aim of the organization is cooperation with every city department. Each city official who speaks is supposed to tell these little citizens what they can do to help in his work, and each member takes a pledge to work to make the city a better place before he or she is invested with the white button bearing the American flag, which is the badge of the league.

Each post has some special work of its own. One of the girls of Clara Barton Post of Public School 2, at the corner of West End avenue and Eighty-second street, supervise the cleaning of their particular block, to the great amusement of the White Wings. The boys of Columbus Post, Public School 38, at 317 West Fifty-second street, have helped the janitors of the neighborhood to clean out their basements to minimize the danger of fires. The girls of Claremont Post, Public School 54, at 144th street and Amsterdam avenue, issue a newspaper filled with news of the organization.

Why Shouldn't Women Vote? Asks Mrs. Whitehouse

Champion of Woman Suffrage Points Out the Twofold Fallacy in Anti's Objection That Women Shouldn't Vote Because They Cannot Fight.

By VIRA BOARMAN WHITEHOUSE.

THE anti-suffragists say that women shouldn't vote because they cannot fight, or, as Sir Almoth Wright expresses it, because their "vote would not represent physical force." He explains that "it is by physical force alone that a nation protects itself against foreign interference." He believes "that the internal equilibrium of the State" is also dependent upon "the authority of physical force."

There seems to be a twofold fallacy in this particular objection of the anti-suffragists. First, that women cannot fight, and second, that they should not vote unless they do fight.

History is full of accounts of not only individual fighting women but whole tribes of amazons. Every one is familiar with stories of such heroines as Boadicea, Joan of Arc, the Maid of Saragossa and the brave women of our own pioneer days. These, it may be granted, were exceptions. Greek authors, however, refer to African Amazons who were said to have overrun Asia and tell of great women warriors who came from Ethiopia in the west.

There were lands of "barbarians" led by women in Persia during the time of Cyrus. Plutarch gives an account of the women of Argos, who defended their city against the Spartans. They did so well that they were afterward allowed on their wedding day to wear false beards on their faces! The women of Germania and Gaul fought against the Romans. In the eighth century there were formidable bands of amazons fighting in Bohemia.

In South America Francisco de Orellana met fierce opposition from fighting women on the banks of the Marañon, which fact caused him to rename it the Amazon. There are accounts given by Gonzalo Pizarro, who quotes Father Carbajal and another missionary, Father Cristobal de Acuna, who had lived long in the Brazil, both of whom speak of women fighting in the front ranks of the Indians.

Sir Walter Raleigh, also, in his story of the discovery of Guiana, tells of fiercely fighting Amazons. In 1792 there was a brigade of women who fought in the French Revolution. Thus history shows that women can fight.

It is reported that in Mexico 5,000 women have organized and have offered their services as soldiers to the army. Women fought when fighting was a question of brute strength. Today they could fight all the better, now that with modern implements of war fighting in itself is more a question of skill than of strength.

But although women have fought and can still fight, the anti-suffragists believe they should vote without fighting. Men who are quite unfit to bear arms or back up their vote by physical force are allowed the ballot. The old, the infirm, the lame, the blind are not disfranchised. Men over 45 vote, although they are counted in the military department of the United States army, as tabulated by Dr. J. H. Baxter, show that of the men examined for military duty during the civil war out of every 1,000 lawyers, 541 were found unfit, of physicians 680, of journalists 740, of preachers 974.

As civilization progresses and life becomes more complex, the various activities of society become more and more separate, one from the other. Fighting has become a specialized form of service, quite apart from assistance from the government or the judiciary. For the most part it is only the trained soldier who goes to war.

In case of a great war, however, the younger, able, non-military men are called to the front. Then the barriers are let down and any man who can bear arms is called upon.

The more men there are who go to the battlefield the heavier are the in-



Copyright Campbell Photo Co.

Mrs. Norman de R. Whitehouse.

direct burdens of war which are thrust upon those at home. The business of life must go on. The fields must be tilled, the looms kept busy. Food and clothes must be provided not only for those left behind but for the armies as well. Do not the women who stay at home with the men take their fair share in the responsibility of war?

Great wars which use up men force women relentlessly into industry. Mrs. Hatch points to the census as indisputably proving this point. Before the civil war women were found in four industries, and after its close in 400. The very existence of a nation and its ability to continue any war is in the hands of its women. A warring nation could not survive even if successful in its struggle if every citizen fought on the battlefield.

"A. M. Anti" says, and he repeats only what the anti-suffragists say constantly, "that it is being demonstrated today, as history has always shown, that with men very properly rests the defence of the nation's honor. This is a clear demonstration of the reason why men alone have been granted the vote in enlightened countries. It is now fully recognized by all fair-minded persons that in matters not pertaining to war and peace the aid of women is of paramount importance and value." But it is in matters pertaining to war and peace that women feel particularly they should be consulted.

Not only do women in times of war bear their great share of the labor of the

nation, but they suffer, through war, as much as or more than men. It is more difficult to be left at home, first to worry, then perhaps to grieve over the loved ones who have gone. Give any man his choice between going to war himself or staying behind and having his mother, daughter, wife or sweetheart march off with flags flying and drums beating to the battlefield, perhaps not to return, and he would probably prefer to go.

The sentimental suffering and the industrial labor are, however, not all that women have to endure in time of war. Suppose a country is conquered and invaded. Think of the brunt of the conflict that the women bear. The tales of their suffering which reached here from the Italians should persuade even an anti-suffragist that women should have a voice in war making. The torture and death which comes to them is without glory.

There is no need even to mention the service that women, as nurses, give in times of war. It is a share too insignificant to be considered in comparison to the other and more real burdens thrust upon them.

As to the second anti-suffrage contention that women shouldn't vote because "the internal equilibrium of the State" is maintained "by the authority of physical force" only, it would appear that in the opinion of the anti-suffragists centuries of civilization have had no effect on men.

In the beginning of human society, before the dawn of civilization, the vote may have represented physical force. Piske gives the following explanation: "In primitive times voting was probably adopted as a substitute for fighting. The smaller, and presumably weaker, party, yielded to the larger without an actual trial of physical strength; heads were counted instead of being broken."

Perhaps there was a time when each individual fighter was considered. Under such an arrangement the strong man may have been given two, three or even four votes to the weak man's one. As in some European countries (Switzerland, Belgium, etc.) the elector is given four votes to the poor man's one. In a democracy, however, the respect for all men's opinions is greater than for either their physical strength or their wealth. So it comes about that President Wilson and Jack Johnson each have one vote as have Mr. Rockefeller and the poorest miner in the strikers' camp of Colorado.

The suffragist believes that the dawn of civilization of the counting of heads instead of the breaking of them, has bred in men a respect for the opinion of the majority, that has nothing to do with the physical force behind it. The normal man now wishes to be lawfully elected. Society guards against the normal or abnormal man by means of the police. Society also through State militia and Federal troops, protects the first of the majority against the first of the minority.

Each individual man, no longer in the beginning of human society, is upon to enforce his opinion of his rights by the authority of the physical force.

The will of the majority is not to count heads rather than to count votes. The police and militia are the instruments through which the majority enforces its will upon the minority. Individual men who oppose the opinion of women, then, are not permitted to express it in the exercise of the majority's will. The majority, by means of the ballot, has the power of the weight of all civilization and the same means of enforcement as the vote of men has.

The suffragists are asking for the vote on the grounds on which their fathers founded their State. They demand: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

expect, the proportions are just the same as in non-suffrage communities like Scotland.

There remain two other questions, the bearing of suffrage on divorce and the increasing frequency of divorce.

In Bryce's "American Commonwealth," Sir Horace Plunkett, eminent for morals, is quoted in regard to Wyoming as follows: "His informants never attempted to connect the frequency of divorce in Wyoming with the political equality of the sexes, conceiving this to have exercised no influence on the family life, nor led to domestic discord." This after over a generation of suffrage.

As to the frequency of divorce, it is a large topic for one paragraph. There is to be said, however. Most suffragists agree with Mrs. Whitehouse that divorce will probably ultimately decrease when women's freedom has been attained. Meanwhile it is in many cases a wholesome symptom. Bernard Shaw has made fun of the American wife who obtained a divorce on grounds of "mental anguish" caused by the husband's neglect to cut his toenails. But Bernard Shaw has also declared that "divorce, in fact, is not the destruction of marriage but the first condition of its maintenance."

He isn't alarmed by the divorces in the State of Washington. "What is quite hideous," he says, "is that the rate in England is only 2 in 100,000, a figure which, if we assume that human nature is much the same in Walworth as in Washington, must represent a frightful quantity of useless unhappiness and domestic poignancy."

The Royal Commission on Divorce in England came to a conclusion that changes with this. It recommended the penalty of divorce on American lines, to serve in that way the interests of "higher standards" of morality.

Unlike Old Doc Smith's Prairie Remedy, woman suffrage will not cure everything. The great virtue of Mrs. Whitehouse's articles is that they are founded on no such illusion, and that they argue the case with a reference to daylight life, and not moonlight nonsense. If her arguments as to the justice and expediency of woman suffrage have caused A. M. Anti to protest with anguish, it merely illustrates the danger of letting one's mind become so stiff that even temperate and circumstantial argument becomes a Mont Blanc in the path of narrow mental routine.